Remarks

No further claims have been amended, cancelled or added. Claims 1-13, 19 and 20 remain pending in the application.

Examiner Interview Request

The Applicant requests an interview with the Examiner prior to issuance of a future office action on the present application. The Applicant believes such an interview may help to clarify any misunderstandings regarding the definitions of the various claim terms and how they distinguish the present invention over the prior art cited by the Examiner.

35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Malkin, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,085,193). Malkin generally describes a predictive caching system. In contrast, the present invention as now claimed in amended independent claims 1 and 8 describes a method of predictive caching and a predictive caching device that also uses delta information in a delta encoding environment. Delta information is defined in the present patent application specification in paragraph [0017] as a selected portion of a web page that may vary between instances of the web page. Malkin fails to disclose the use of delta information in any form of delta encoding. In addition, the particular predictive caching algorithm claimed in claims 1 and 8 creates predictions based on information about the request and a referring page that indicates an object just previously requested by the client. Malkin does not teach the use of information about the request or a referring page in generating hints or predictions. In short, Malkin does not teach predictive caching with delta encoding and does not teach creating predictions page as specified in independent claims 1 and 8.

Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1 and therefore are allowable over Malkin for the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable. Claims 9-13, 19, and 20 depend from claim 8 and therefore are allowable over Malkin for the same reasons that claim 8 is allowable.

Claims 1 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Becker, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,878,223). Like Malkin, Becker generally describes a predictive caching system. Similarly, like Malkin, Becker fails to disclose the use of delta information in any form of delta encoding. In addition, the particular predictive caching algorithm claimed in claims 1 and 8 creates predictions based on information about the request and a referring page that indicates an object just previously requested by the client. Becker does not teach the use of information about the request or a referring page in generating hints or predictions. In short, Becker does not teach predictive caching with delta encoding and does not teach creating predictions page as specified in independent claims 1 and 8.

Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1 and therefore are allowable over Becker for the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable. Claims 9-13, 19, and 20 depend from claim 8 and therefore are allowable over Becker for the same reasons that claim 8 is allowable.

Therefore, under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), neither Malkin nor Becker teach the present invention as claimed in claims 1 and 8 and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

<u>35 U.S.C. §103</u>

Claims 1-13, and 19-20 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mogul (U.S. Patent No. 5,802,292) in view of Mogul (HTTP Delta Clusters and Templates, Publication date: 24 August 2000). Applicant respectfully suggests that any motivation to combine Mogul '292 with Mogul is not found in either reference. But for the hindsight gained in reviewing the present patent application specification, no such combination would have been contemplated by one of ordinary skill in the art. The gist of the present invention, as claimed, involves a novel combination of web page retrieval latency reduction techniques. The novel combination is to use both predictive caching and delta encoding in a single system. Prior to the present inventors, no other person of ordinary skill in the art has suggested combining these two techniques into a single system or method of reducing latency in web page retrieval. As such, the use of hindsight based on the present patent application is simply not permissible. The

Applicant submits that the rejection based on a combination of Mogul '292 with Mogul is not proper and should be withdrawn.

In addition, even if the teachings of Mogul '292 are combined with Mogul, the references when considered individually or together in combination, fail to suggest or teach all of the elements of the presently pending independent claims 1 and 8. For example, neither Mogul '292 nor Mogul teach creating predictions based on (1) information about the request and (2) a referring page that indicates an object just previously requested by the client, as specified in independent claims 1 and 8. More precisely, Mogul '292 does not, as the Examiner has previously suggested, teach creating predictions based on criteria that includes an object just previously requested by the client.

Furthermore, neither Mogul '292 nor Mogul disclose sending a client both (1) a hint for the next object to download and (2) delta information for the requested object, as specified in independent claims 1 and 8. Please note that delta information is defined in the present patent application as a selected portion of a web page that may vary between instances of the web page as was previously noted in these remarks. In other words, delta information is not merely calculation information, but rather includes a web object that forms a portion of a web page. Neither Mogul '292 nor Mogul disclose sending this delta information about a web page along with a hint.

Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1 and therefore are allowable over Mogul '292 and Mogul for the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable. Claims 9-13, 19, and 20 depend from claim 8 and therefore are allowable over Mogul '292 and Mogul for the same reasons that claim 8 is allowable.

Therefore, under 35 USC §103(a), Mogul '292 and Mogul fail to teach the present invention as claimed in claims 1-3, 19, and 20 and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

The Applicant has reviewed the other references cited the by Examiner and determined that they do not teach or suggest the present invention as claimed.

Conclusion

On the basis of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-13, 19, and 20 are now believed to be in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

DIGITAL RIVER, INC.
By its agents:

NORTH OAKS PATENT AGENCY
45 Island Road
North Oaks, Minnesota 55127
(612) 850-1688

Date: _30 June 2006_   By: _____

Shawn B. Dempster, Registration No. 34,321